

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

HAKKASAN LV, LLC, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

MARK DANIEL ADAMCZYK, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No.: 2:14-cv-01717-GMN-NJK

ORDER

Pending before the Court is the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Nancy J. Koppe, (ECF No. 84), which recommends that the Court denies the Renewed Motion for Default Judgment, (ECF No. 76), and that the claims against Defendants iDrive Orlando, LLC; James Patrick Adamczyk; and My Domain Holdings, LLC (collectively “Defendants”) be dismissed. Because of this, Judge Koppe further recommends that the Court deny the Amended Motion for Permanent Injunction, (ECF No. 77), filed by Plaintiffs Hakkasan LV, LLC, and Hakkasan Limited (collectively “Plaintiffs”).

A party may file specific written objections to the findings and recommendations of a United States Magistrate Judge made pursuant to Local Rule IB 1-4. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B); D. Nev. R. IB 3-2. Upon the filing of such objections, the Court must make a de novo determination of those portions to which objections are made. *Id.* The Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the Magistrate Judge. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); D. Nev. IB 3-2(b). Where a party fails to object, however, the Court is not required to conduct “any review at all . . . of any issue that is not the subject of an objection.” *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985). Indeed, the Ninth Circuit has recognized that a district court is not required to review a magistrate judge’s report and recommendation

1 where no objections have been filed. *See, e.g., United States v. Reyna–Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114,
2 1122 (9th Cir. 2003).

3 Here, no objections were filed, and the deadline to do so has passed.

4 Accordingly,


5 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that the Report and Recommendation, (ECF No. 84), is
6 **ACCEPTED AND ADOPTED** in full.

7 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Plaintiffs’ Amended Motion for Default Judgment,
8 (ECF No. 76), is **DENIED**.

9 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Plaintiffs’ Amended Motion for Permanent
10 Injunction, (ECF No. 77), is **DENIED**.

11 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the claims against Defendants are **DISMISSED**.

12
13 **DATED** this ²⁸ day of April, 2017.

14
15 
16 _____
17 Gloria M. Navarro, Chief Judge
18 United States District Court
19
20
21
22
23
24
25